### **1nc/1ar**

#### **He refers to himself as “we”—that causes pompousness, imprecision, and is just downright silly. End this!**

Blau ’13 (Adrian, Senior Lecturer in Politics at King’s College London, “Against the royal ‘we’? All those in favour, say ‘I’”, BlauBlog, 5/27, <https://adrianblau.wordpress.com/2013/05/27/against-the-royal-we-all-those-in-favour-say-i/>) OS

At school, many of us were taught not to say ‘I’ in writing. I disagree. Or should that be ‘the present author disagrees’? And that is part of my objection: avoiding ‘I’ can end up sounding pompous. One example comes from the historian J.G.A. Pocock, on p. 3 of his book Politics, Language, and Time: The present author, who seems to himself to have been concerned in this transformation from an early stage, here brings forward a number of essays designed to illustrate its character. This is Pocock, in a book he has written, describing a transformation he was involved in, talking as if he is someone else! Another example involves the royal ‘we’ – for example, ‘we believe that Jones is wrong’, or ‘we now turn to a second claim’. This is how monarchs often talk: ‘we thank you for your kind message’. To me, this sounds pompous. Of course, there are times when ‘we’ is right. For example, in an academic article you might describe Jones’s errors and say ‘we have seen that Jones is wrong; but are these errors fundamental?’. And you really mean ‘we have seen’ here: if you have made your case correctly, then you and your readers will indeed have seen that Jones is wrong. But unless you are writing with a co-author, many other uses of ‘we’ sound odd, such as ‘we believe that Jones is wrong’. You and who else? Saying ‘I’ also makes clearer when an argument is yours. This is particularly important in student essays, where good criticism leads to higher marks. If a student has made her own criticism, saying ‘I believe that Jones’s view is simplistic’ makes clear that the argument is hers; saying ‘Jones’s view can be criticised as being simplistic’ is ambiguous

#### Stop emulating policy—you’re falling prey to their elitism.

Cartier ’08 (Reginald, lawyer, “If Challenging Tradition Means Doing Policy Debate, I'll Stick With Tradition: The Corruption of Policy Debate,” 6/22, <http://globaldebateblog.blogspot.com/2008/06/case-for-and-against-policy-debate-vs.html>) OS

Policy's elitism is just annoying and makes you look snobbish and arrogant. This isn't an attack on the debate of Policy, but instead an attack on how some of the of the "upper elite" of Policy can be. Everyone has their favorite type of debate, whether it be Policy or Public Forum. (If the latter is your favorite type of debate, seek help.) But one thing that distinguishes Policy debaters over all others is their snobbish elitism. If you asked me what my favorite type of debate was, I'd simply say, "Parli (Parliamentary Debate) and LD." If you asked a Policy debater what the best type of debate was, they'd say something along the lines of, "Policy debate is far superior than any type of debate, and anyone doing anything less isn't a real debater elitist garbage blahblablbahblah I'm incompetent." I'm proud to be an LDer, but Policy debaters act like they're this superior social movement and we're all just underlings compared to them. What's worse is the people who feel like they are supposed to like the garbage like spreading because they are "hardcore" Policy debaters. Wow, you are such an underling that you can't even formulate your own opinion? That's like a Republican who feels like he HAS to vote for the Republican candidate, even though he feels that the Democrat would be a better president.

#### Proven by the fact that you’re not even adopting their norms—just their random mannerisms. You REALLY wanna be them.

#### Reject the aff/neg—pompousness destroys value to life.

Zakrzewski ’16 (Vicki, Ph.D. in Education and Positive Psychology is the education director of the Greater Good Science Center, “How Humility Will Make You the Greatest Person Ever,” Greater Good Science Center at the University of California, Berkeley, 1/12/16) PO bracketed for gender

In light of the [upcoming presidential race](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/10/opinion/sunday/obnoxiousness-is-the-new-charisma.html?hpw&rref=sunday-review&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&module=well-region&region=bottom-well&WT.nav=bottom-well) and the increase in [narcissism amongst our youth](http://psr.sagepub.com/content/15/2/180), I think it’s safe to say that, as a society, we could use a little more humility. Our culture places so much value on external accomplishments, appearance, and self-aggrandizement—all things that are ephemeral at best—that even a small display of this quiet virtue can make one feel like a drowning [hu]man coming up for air. Yet why can it be so challenging for us to express humility? Is it because we often misinterpret its active demonstration to be a sign of weakness, when in actuality it is an indication of tremendous inner strength? The answers may be found in what scientists are discovering about this quality—one so deeply revered by all spiritual traditions that many consider it to be the mother of all virtues. Why is humility good? When I meet someone who radiates humility, my shoulders relax, my heart beats a little more quietly, and something inside me lets go. Why? Because I know that I’m being fully seen, heard, and accepted for who I am, warts and all—a precious and rare gift that allows our protective walls to come down. Truly humble people are able to offer this kind of gift to us because they see and accept their own strengths and limitations without [defensiveness or judgment](http://sonjalyubomirsky.com/files/2012/09/Chancellor-Lyubomirsky-in-press.pdf)—a core dimension, according to researchers, of humility, and one that cultivates a powerful [compassion for humanity](http://greatergood.berkeley.edu/tag/humanity). This kind of self-acceptance emerges from grounding one’s worth in our intrinsic value as human beings rather than things such as six-figure salaries or the [body of a movie star](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/10/opinion/sunday/when-can-women-stop-trying-to-look-perfect.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=opinion-c-col-right-region&region=opinion-c-col-right-region&WT.nav=opinion-c-col-right-region) or climbing the corporate ladder or the number of friends on Facebook. Instead, humble people place [high value on more meaningful things](http://www.amazon.com/Character-Strengths-Virtues-Handbook-Classification/dp/0195167015) that benefit others, such as noble qualities. They also see life as a school, recognizing that while none of us is perfect, we can, without negatively impacting our self-esteem, work on our limitations by being open to new ideas, advice, and criticism. This ability alone cultivates an awe-inspiring inner strength, the most powerful example of which is Gandhi, whose [Autobiography](http://www.amazon.com/Gandhi-Autobiography-Story-Experiments-Truth/dp/0807059099/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1452535901&sr=1-1&keywords=ghandi+autobiography) is a journey of humbling self-dissection. He once famously said, “I claim to be a simple individual liable to err like any other fellow mortal. I own, however, that I have humility enough to confess my errors and to retrace my steps.” If Gandhi is an example of what a humble leader can accomplish, then society serves to benefit from this kind of governance. Consider what researchers of the [“quiet ego”](http://www.amazon.com/Transcending-Self-Interest-Psychological-Explorations-Quiet/dp/1433803402/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1452535861&sr=1-1&keywords=psychology+of+the+quiet+ego)—a construct similar to humility—suggest happens when we gain control of our ego: we become less likely to act aggressively, manipulate others, express dishonesty, and destroy resources. Instead, we take responsibility for and correct our mistakes, listen to others’ ideas, and keep our abilities in humble perspective. Who wouldn’t want that kind of leadership for our country—and the world? But the benefits of humility do not extend to just our leaders. Nascent research suggests that this lovely quality is good for us individually and for our relationships. For example, humble people [handle stress](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17439760.2015.1127991) more effectively and report higher levels of [physical](http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/pubs/abs/6626) and [mental well-being](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17439760.2013.820337). They also show greater [generosity](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17439760.2012.671348), [helpfulness](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17439760600885671), and [gratitude](http://sonjalyubomirsky.com/files/2012/09/Kruse-Chancellor-Ruberton-Lyubomirsky-in-press1.pdf)—all things that can only serve to draw us closer to others.

### at: my coaches and authors and all those who have helped me along my path

#### [1] Still bizarre because they’re not here, and because of certain contexts.

Overing ’17 (Bob, no quals, comment on “10 Things I Like and Don’t Like (Bob Overing),” Premier Debate, 1/20, <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2017/01/20/10-things-i-like-and-dont-like-bob-overing/>) OS

@Grant, I’ve thought about that, and I kind of like the justification because it’s a nice nod and quite respectful. But when they’re not in the room and not the ones arguing, it’s still a little weird. And there are some contexts in which it doesn’t make sense, but you likely don’t switch, e.g. “extend our perm.” Unless your coach wrote “perm do both” for you on a piece of paper, I kinda think you should say “extend my perm” if you’re going to use a possessive there.

#### [2] Still obviously comes from emulating policy—it NEVER happened before policy-esque schools started doing it.

#### [3] You’re definitely lying to be honest.

#### [4] Your coaches didn’t write or make every argument with you.